UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,196	06/11/2008	Young-Hoon Park	93874.00201	4004

21839 7590 03/05/2009

BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER	
FRONDA, CHRISTIAN L	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1652	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/05/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/582,196	PARK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHRISTIAN L. FRONDA	1652	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09 June 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-3 as listed in the claim set filed 06/09/2006, are pending and under consideration in this Office Action.

2. Claim 1 is objected to since the claim should recite "containing at least one mutant gene selected from the group consisting of" for precision and readability.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 USC 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The claim, as written, do not sufficiently distinguish over *E.coli* strains as they exist naturally because the claims do not particularly point out any non-naturally occurring differences between the claimed products and the naturally occurring products. In the absence of the hand of man, the naturally occurring products are considered non-statutory subject matter. *See Diamond v. Chakrabarty*, 447 U.S. 303, 206 USPQ 193 (1980). The claim should be amended to indicate the hand of the inventor, e.g., by insertion of "An isolated L-tryptophan producing *E.coli* ". See MPEP 2105.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

According to MPEP 2164.01(a), factors considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is "undue" include, but are not limited to: (A) The breadth of the claims; (B) The nature of the invention; (C) The state of the prior art; (D) The level of one of ordinary skill; (E) The level of predictability in the art; (F) The amount of direction provided by the inventor; (G) The existence of working examples; and (H) The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. MPEP§ 2164.04 states that while the analysis and conclusion of a lack of enablement are based on the factors discussed in MPEP § 2164.01(a) and the evidence as a whole, it is not necessary to discuss each factor in the written enablement rejection. The language should focus on those factors, reasons, and evidence that lead the examiner to conclude that the specification fails to teach how to make and use the claimed invention without undue experimentation, or that the scope of any enablement provided to one skilled in the art is not commensurate with the scope of protection sought by the claims. Accordingly, the factors most relevant to the instant rejection are addressed in detail below.

The nature and breadth of the claims encompass any L-tryptophan producing *E.coli* mutant strain containing at least one mutant gene selected from the group consisting of *aroF*, *aroG*, *trpR* , and *tryR* related with tryptophan biosynthesis, mutant strain E.coli CJ285 KCCM-10534, and a production method of L-tryptophan using said stains.

While the specification shows that E.coli CJ285 KCCM-10534 was obtained by random mutagenesis methods employing the chemical mutagen N-methyl-N'-nitro-N-nitrosoguanidine (NTG) and subsequent nucleotide sequencing of its *aroF*, *aroG*, *trpR* , and *tryR* genes; the specification does not provide guidance, prediction, and working examples for making and using the claimed invention. The specification only shows searching and screening for mutants such as E.coli CJ285 which have the desired overproduction of L-tryptophan compared to unmutated parent strain CJ181, where the parent strain CJ181 was subjected to NTG treatment and mutants were searched and screed for that have overproduction of L-tryptophan. Therefore, one skilled in the art would not know how to make and use the claimed invention without performing an undue amount of trial and error experimentation, which includes treating any parent E.coli strain with NTG, searching and screening for mutants that have the desired overproduction of L-tryptophan compared to unmutated parent strain, and sequencing its *aroF*, *aroG*, *trpR* , and *tryR* genes to determine if any mutations are present. Therefore, in view of the overly broad scope of the claims, the specification's lack of specific guidance and prediction, the specification's lack of additional working examples, and the amount of experimentation required; it would require undue experimentation for a one skilled in the art to make and use the invention recited in these claims.

Furthermore, it is apparent that the E.coli CJ285 of Accession number KCCM-10534 is required to practice the claimed invention. As such the E.coli CJ285 recited in claim 2 must be readily available or obtainable by a repeatable method set forth in the specification, or otherwise readily available to the public. However, the specification does not disclose a repeatable process to obtain the E.coli CJ285. It is not apparent if the source materials to make the E.coli CJ285 are both known and readily available to the public. The requirements of 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, may be satisfied by a deposit of the E.coli CJ285.

Applicants' referral to deposit number Accession number KCCM-10534 is noted but is considered insufficient assurance that all of the conditions of 37 CFR 1.801-1.809 have been met since there is no indication in the specification as to public availability. Claim 3 is also included because the claim does not correct the defect of claim 2.

If the deposit is made under the terms of the Budapest Treaty, then an affidavit or declaration by the applicant, or a statement by an attorney of record over his/her signature and registration number, stating that the specific microorganism has been deposited under the Budapest Treaty and that the strain will be irrevocably and without restriction or condition released to the public upon the issuance of the patent, would satisfy the deposit requirement made herein.

If the deposit has not been made under the Budapest Treaty, then in order to certify that the deposit meets the criteria set forth in 37 C.F.R. 1.801-1.809 and MPEP 2402-2411.05, the applicant may provide assurance or compliance by an affidavit or declaration, or by a statement by an attorney of record over his/her signature and registration number, showing that:

(1) during the pendency of this application, access to the invention will be afforded to the Commissioner upon request;

(2) all restriction upon availability to the public will be irrevocably removed upon granting of the patent;

(3) the deposit will be maintained in a public repository for a period of 30 years or 5 years after the last request or for the effective life of the patent, whichever is longer; and

(4) the deposit will be replaced if it should ever become inviable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1 are 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Storbakk et al. (J Mol Biol. 1996 Mar 15;256(5):889-96; PTO 892).

Storbakk et al. teach L-tryptophan producing *E.coli* mutant strains comprising a mutation of *trpR* related with tryptophan biosynthesis, where the encoded TrpR was mutated by sited directed mutagenesis; and culturing of these strains where culturing inherently leads to production of L-tryptophan. See entire publication, especially pages 889-892 and Figures 1-4. Therefore, the reference teachings anticipate the claims.

Conclusion

9. No claims are allowed.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christian L Fronda whose telephone number is (571)272-0929. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays between 9:00AM - 6:30PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nashaat Nashed can be reached on (571)272-0934. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)273-8300.

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christian L. Fronda/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1652